



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,486	12/24/2001	Ken Igarashi	15689.94	9280

7590 04/25/2006

ADRIAN J. LEE
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER

BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/026,486	Applicant(s) IGARASHI, KEN	
	Examiner Kevin Bates	Art Unit 2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response a communication received on March 9, 2006.

The Power of Attorney was received December 20, 2005.

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haas (5566225) (Applicants IDS).

Regarding claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, Haas teaches a proxy service control method for executing a service on a proxy server control apparatus connected between a user's terminal and a server (Column 5, lines 26 – 31) on behalf of an application in said user's terminal (Column 5, lines 26 – 31), said service being provided on a session get between said application and said server (Column 4, lines 24 – 27), the method being characterized by comprising:

a storage step of storing session information on said session in response to said user's request (Column 5, lines 34 – 39, where the base station contains information of state of the session and the necessary information to emulate the connection);

a monitor step of monitoring whether or not said session is being continued between said application and said server (Column 5, lines 21 – 25));

a proxy step of reproducing a session said server and said proxy service control apparatus to execute said service on behalf of said application on the basis of said session information stored in said storage step if it is determined in said monitor step that said session has been interrupted (Column 5, lines 26 – 31); and

a transfer step of transferring service results received in said proxy step, from said proxy service control apparatus to said application (Column 6, lines 47 – 50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas in view of Jamtgaard (6430624).

Regarding claims 2, 4, 6, and 8, Dowling teaches the proxy service control method as claimed in claim 1, 3, 5, and 7.

Haas does not explicitly indicate that the system comprises a detection step of detecting an ability of said application to receive said service and a conversion step of converting said service results received in said proxy step, into a different reception form on the basis of said ability detected in the detection step and in that said transfer step transfers said service in said reception form converted in said conversion step.

Jamtgaard teaches a proxy system that acts as a conversion system between a server and a user device (Column 2, lines 54 – 59). Jamtgaard's system discloses a

Art Unit: 2155

detection step of detecting an ability of said application to receive said service and a conversion step of converting said service results received in said proxy step, into a different reception form on the basis of said ability detected in the detection step and in that said transfer step transfers said service in said reception form converted in said conversion step (Column 2, line 60 – Column 3, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Jamtgaard's formation conversion system in Dowling's proxy server in order to allow one content server to provide content for any combination of devices, protocols, and mark up languages (Column 1, line 60 – Column 2, line 3).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 9, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that the reference, Haas, does not disclose reproducing the user session and executing the service on behalf of the application. The examiner disagrees, Haas discloses the system where the proxy service emulates the user application for the host application on behalf of the client (Column 48 – 52), which is the same as reproducing the connection that was between the end-user and the host application, which is now between the agent and the host user, thus this also entails emulating the current behavior of the client on the system to maintain the session, this would also include maintaining the service connection of the application which can be considered executing the service, since the service is maintained all awhile the host

application does not know that the client has been disconnected (Column 5, lines 26 – 31).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
April 17, 2006


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER